

REMARKS

The Office Action of 20 August 2003 has been reviewed and this is a response to that action. The rejections of Claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Onderak et al. and 1-11 as unpatentable over Onderak et al. in view of Juneau are again traversed, particularly in view of the present amendment. Claim 1 recites a cover material on the top and on the bottom surfaces of the insulating piece, and provides an integral, one-piece construction. This is not disclosed by Onderak et al. As previously shown in Response B the Onderak et al. and Juneau references are incompatible with each other. Claim 11 has been cancelled and its content added to claim 1.

Without prejudice to Applicant's point in Response B that an unexpected result is not the *sine qua non* of non-obviousness, the Rule 132 Declaration provided herewith shows such unexpected results. A valuable product has been provided to users and channels of trade with its value resting on its merits, consistent with claim language, and minimal other factors. An obviousness determination must include the differences between the claims and the art, level of skill of the art and real life experience.

Taking those factors into account the section 103 rejection should be withdrawn.

All of the claims define patentably over the cited prior art, and the rejections should be withdrawn and all of claims 1-10 allowed.


A telephone conference is requested. Please call the undersigned at 617-854-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN L. CARTIER, Applicant

Dated: November 20, 2003

By:



Jerry Cohen
Reg. No. 20,522
Attorney for Applicant